

REMARKS

Upon entry of the above amendment, claim 7 will have been amended and claim 8 will have been newly submitted. Although Applicant does not agree with the rejections set forth by the Examiner, Applicant has nevertheless amended claim 7 to enhance the clarity thereof. Further, Applicant submits that support for the amendment can be found for example, on page 14 of the original specification. Accordingly, for at least each of the reasons set forth below, as well as the previously submitted arguments (e.g., remarks filed on June 8, 2005), Applicant respectfully requests passage of the present application to issue, as the combination of features recited in the pending claims are clearly patentable over the applied references, taken individually or in combination.

In this regard, Applicant submits that an aspect of the diaphragm control apparatus, as recited in the claims, is to include a diaphragm control signal setting device comprising a digital potentiometer and a memory. The digital potentiometer varies a wiper position of a variable resistor and outputs the remote diaphragm control signal corresponding to the wiper position only when the remote diaphragm control is input. Also, the memory contains a value corresponding to the wiper position when electrical power is interrupted. Accordingly, the diaphragm control apparatus is configured to not only provide remote diaphragm control, but is also configured to return the diaphragm to a stored position upon power restoration.

However, Applicant submits that the above-mentioned combination of features, as recited in the claims, are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the applied references. Moreover, the Examiner even admits that ARAI, KAWAHARA, and YAMAMOTO "do not disclose the use of a potentiometer which is a digital

potentiometer” (e.g. Office Action of 6/28/2005).

Due to the shortcomings of these references, the Examiner relies upon “Official Notice” and refers to BRUNOLLI (U.S. Patent No. 6,201,491) and ASHE (U.S. Patent No. 5,495,245) as evidentiary support for the “Official Notice”. However, Applicant submits that BRUNOLLI and ASHE, alone or in combination, fail to disclose a digital potentiometer that varies a wiper position only when a remote diaphragm control signal is input, as recited in the claimed combination.

Rather, BRUNOLLI is directed towards improving linearity by minimizing the amount of resistive error of switches that switch the resistive elements of a potentiometer. Furthermore, ASHE does not teach the above-mentioned feature, but is directed towards a voltage scaling DAC that can be used as a potentiometer or rheostat. Additionally, BRUNOLLI and ASHE are silent with respect to diaphragms and control thereof by remote signals, as recited in the claimed combinations. That is, BRUNOLLI and ASHE, each fail to disclose or even suggest a digital potentiometer that varies a wiper position only when a remote diaphragm control signal is input, as recited in the claims.

Accordingly, as the applied references, individually or in combination, fail to disclose the combination of features recited in the claims, Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the allowability of all pending claims, as well as passage of the present application to issue.

Furthermore, Applicant submits new claim 8 for the Examiner’s consideration. New claim 8 is allowable for the combination of features recited therein. For example, new claim 8 recites, inter alia, that the memory is provided in the lens of the CCTV

camera. However, Applicant submits that these features are not disclosed by at least KAWAHARA, which was relied upon by the Examiner for disclosing "a memory".

Rather, KAWAHARA is directed towards forcedly setting the aperture to the aperture value stored in the camera unit and not to a value stored in the lens when power is re-supplied, as indicated in column 6, lines 60-67. Accordingly, in addition to claims 4-7, Applicant also respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the allowability of the subject matter provided in new claim 8.

Thus, in view of the amendments and arguments herein, Applicant submits that claim 7 is in condition for allowance. With regard to dependent claims 4-6 and 8, Applicant asserts that they are allowable on their own merit, as well as because they depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 7, which Applicant has shown to be allowable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims in the present application are clearly patentable over the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, and an indication to such effect is respectfully requested, in due course.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the fact that none of the art of record, whether considered alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the present invention as now defined by the pending claims, and in further view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the Examiner's action and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested and are believed to be appropriate.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should an extension of time be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application, including any extensions of time required to place the application in condition for allowance by an Examiner's Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

If there should be any questions concerning this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Masayuki ARAI



Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

William Pieprz
Reg. No. 33,630

July 8, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191